



Missouri Department of Natural Resources

Water Quality Coordinating Committee Water Protection Program

Minutes

April 20, 2004

WATER QUALITY COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Columbia Environmental Research Center
4200 New Haven Road
Columbia, Missouri

April 20, 2004
10:00 a.m.

MEETING AGENDA

Source Water Protection Plans

Frank McDaniels, DNR, Water Protection Program, Public Drinking Water Branch

Watershed Planning Requirements for 319 Grants

John Johnson, DNR, Water Protection Program, Water Pollution Control Branch

Local Watershed Planning Activities and Assistance

Dan Downing, University of Missouri Extension

Other

303(d) List Issues - Update

Letters of Approval for Animal Feeding Operations

Agency Activities

Meetings & Conferences

MISSOURI WATER QUALITY COORDINATING COMMITTEE

April 20, 2004

Columbia Environmental Research Center
4200 New Haven Road
Columbia, Missouri

MINUTES

Attendees:

Becky Shannon	DNR/WPSCD/WPP-WPCB	Larry Shepard	EPA Region VII
Pete Davis	EPA Region VII	Tom Herrmann	Clean Water Commission
Gail Wilson	DNR/WPSCD/WPP-WPCB	Dorris Bender	Independence Water Pollution
Paul Andre	MO Dept. of Agriculture	Frank McDaniels	DNR/WPSCD/WPP-PDWB
Donna Menown	DNR/WPSCD/WPP-WPCB	Bob Hentges	MO Public Utility Alliance
Ann Crawford	DNR/WPSCD/WPP-WPCB	Angel Kruzen	Water Sentinel/Sierra Club
Colleen Meredith	DNR/WPSCD/WPP-WPCB	Terry Frueh	Watershed Cons. Boone Co.
Cindy DiStefano	MO Dept. of Conservation	Bob Lerch	USDA - ARS
Ken Struempf	DNR/WPSCD/SWCP	Bart Hawcroft	MO Dept of Agriculture
Amy Salveter	US Fish & Wildlife	John Johnson	DNR/WPSCD/WPP
Troy Chockley	USDA - NRCS	Terry Timmons	DNR/WPSCD/WPP-PDWB
Miya Barr	USGS – WRD	Greg Anderson	DNR/WPSCD/WPP-WPCB
Bob Broz	UMC – Outreach & Extension	Phil Schroeder	DNR/WPSCD/WPP-WPCB
Dan Downing	UMC – Outreach & Extension	Darlene Schaben	DNR/WPSCD/WPP-WPCB

Introductions were made.

Source Water Protection Plans

Frank McDaniels, DNR, Water Protection Program, Public Drinking Water Branch (PDWB)
Handouts: List of Water Supplies in the state, Status as of January 31, 2004; Guidelines for Developing a Source Water Protection Plan (SWPP); Source Water Protection Summary as of January 31, 2004; Source Water Protection & System Security Class Agenda.

Frank explained that the Source Water Protection Program is a federally funded and voluntary program. If a water supply participates in the program, they are asked to follow specific guidelines.

The task force that was formed a couple of years ago, which included staff from the Water Pollution Control Branch, Public Drinking Water Branch, UMC, Missouri Rural Water Association and EPA, has created a booklet using information from the Wellhead Protection Program and the assessment of all sources in the state, public drinking water supplies, along with new information developed from the group. The booklet is now in the review process and should be available this year. From the booklet, a pamphlet and two sets of guidelines have also been developed. The guidelines are used to determine if a community should be in the SWPP.

Starting with 80 surface water supplies, because of the atrazine problems, all but 30 have either completed an SWPP or are in the process or said they were not interested. Rural Water Association also receives federal funding to do source water protection. The Rural Water Association will be working with those supplies which have not expressed an interest in the source water protection program. Out of 1500 community water supplies, 34 have an approved SWPP. Approximately 24% of the population served by community water supplies have an approved SWPP.

Frank said that all water systems need an SWPP. The PDWB is concentrating on assisting communities with plan development because they pump the largest amount of water. Frank passed out a document containing the guidelines for developing a SWPP if the community water supplies want a DNR approved plan. The main requirement for an SWPP is that they must have an emergency operation plan. They must also be in compliance with all other regulations. The SWPPs are revised every four years.

To inform the public, Frank said they will begin having classes for water operators who are required to have renewal training hours. A class will be held at each regional office beginning now through the end of June. Attendees will be those who will be working with water supplies on an SWPP. Frank said the class agenda will be posted on the Internet soon. It will also be included in the next issue of the Water & Wastewater Digest. Training classes will be limited to 30 operators and 5 regional office staff.

Frank is the contact for Source Water Protection [frank.mcdaniels@dnr.mo.gov or by phone at (573) 526-5449]. Don Scott is the contact for questions on assessment (don.scott@dnr.mo.gov).

From the assessment, the first 25% of systems determined to be the most susceptible to contamination will be mailed a packet containing information to help them get started on wellhead protection. Packets have already been sent to 230 engineering companies who deal with water supplies.

Watershed Planning Requirements for 319 Grants

John Johnson, DNR, Water Protection Program, Water Pollution Control Branch

Handout: DNR Nonpoint Source Grant Program Changes – Watershed Planning (PowerPoint Presentation); EPA's Supplemental Guidelines for the Award of Section 319 NPS Grants

The goal of the Missouri Nonpoint Source (NPS) Grant Program is to protect or improve the quality of Missouri's waters that are impaired or threatened by NPS pollution. John explained that Section 319 of the Clean Water Act provides funding from EPA through DNR. DNR then subgrants this funding to project sponsors to address NPS pollution. The yearly allocation is split between base funding and incremental funding with each having its own set of guidelines for use. The overall funding priorities are to restore the quality of impaired waters, demonstrate innovative approaches, locally-led and interagency coordination, integrate funding sources and stress pollution prevention.

Base funding can be used for developing watershed plans, conduct NPS monitoring and program assessment activities, information/education activities, riparian habitat enhancement, monitoring and assessment, technology transfer and training, and Clean Lakes projects. Incremental funding is utilized for demonstration and implementation projects.

Over the years, this has seemed to dictate watershed planning efforts. In FY99-2000, the focus was on development and implementation of a watershed restoration action strategy (WRAS). In FY2001, the focus was to implement the WRAS and develop and implement total maximum daily loads (TMDLs). John described a WRAS and the elements to be addressed in it. John mentioned that the North Fork Watershed WRAS is a good example and that it is still being used today. In FY2002, the focus was on the development and implementation of NPS TMDLs within 303(d) listed waters, develop watershed-based plans that describe how to implement NPS TMDLs and implement NPS TMDLs for which watershed plans have been completed. John talked about the elements needed in watershed plans that would implement a NPS TMDL. For FY2003, the focus was to develop and implement a Watershed Management Plan using the nine critical elements, and an emphasis was on projects that restore impaired waters or address unimpaired waters in high-priority waters not currently impaired by NPS. Also, load reduction reporting and watershed plans are required. John said the milestones should reflect the goals.

For FY2004, the key changes are that a watershed management plan must be developed before receiving 319 funding; the nine key elements must be included; the emphasis will be on projects that restore impaired waters on the 303(d) list; and an estimation of load reduction is required.

Discussions followed on available funding for completing a watershed management plan, who would do the monitoring component or would a model be used, and how the plans are approved. John said there needs to be discussions about how to get consistency in the plans. A comment was made that the right people need to be involved at the beginning in the planning process. It is important that the plan have a start date so that it doesn't just get written then sit on a shelf and nothing done with it. One concern is that they don't want to create something that would conflict with other programs, like the SWPP. Flexibility is needed. Quantification is another important factor.

A new requirement is that project sponsors will be asked for annual reporting on load reduction. This information will be gathered and reported to EPA in an annual report.

Watershed management plans should start now on the 303(d) listed waters. John thought that with more planning and more implementation, the projects would more easily meet their goals. A comment was made that a consensus was needed on the different plans before working with the general public or watershed groups.

Local Watershed Planning Activities and Assistance

Dan Downing, University of Missouri Outreach & Extension
PowerPoint Presentation

Dan said that the title "Grass-roots Locally Led, Watershed Management" really says a lot. It's talking about locally led efforts; the concept of changing the perspective or giving a different aspect of what is a community. The concept of a community is setting some kind of parameter to operate within. This is a concept of a watershed as a community. If a public drinking water supply is trying to deal with pesticide issues, there is still a preconceived mindset of what that community is. The key is the involvement and ownership by the local people. They need to go back to the groups and create a sense of community and help redefine what a community is. The regulatory component can help. Dan gave the example of the Jacks Fork group, the Jacks Fork Watershed Committee, that got going because of it being on the 303(d) list as impaired for bacterial levels. Public meetings were held and asked for people interested in being involved in an on-going process. As a holistic watershed management group, they thought about all the issues they wanted to address within this watershed with the bacterial loading and TMDL being only a part. They could then think as a community about common issues and things they would like to see done. It takes the spotlight off DNR as directing them to get something done.

MCL's of drinking water, TMDLs and Source Water Protection Plans can all be reasons to give groups for why they need to get together and do something in their watershed. Plans can be written by agency, city and county officials but they won't be as effective or successful and have the impact if they don't have local involvement and local acceptance.

The 319 Grassroots project is currently focusing on Bowling Green. They started trying to set up a watershed management group in 1998. Just recently they were able to get city, agency and local people at a meeting and started working toward writing a SWPP using the developed checklist. There are a couple of landowners that are interested in enrolling into the CREP.

The Shoal Creek, Elk River and Jacks Fork watershed groups were created as part of the TMDL process. DNR held public forums introducing the idea of TMDLs and what they mean. Working groups were created from attendees. They were asked to recruit missing members, like a city official or someone else that might need to be more involved with the process. The Elk River group has developed their organizational structure, then will focus on the issues and set priorities. The Jacks Fork group has teamed up with the local RC&D and is requesting a 319 minigrant to put up signage along the river for public accessible restroom facilities. The Shoal Creek group has focused on the structure to develop constitution by-laws and pursue their not-for-profit status. They are looking at the upper reaches of the watershed, which includes cattle and poultry producers.

The current focus of the Grassroots project is to work with Vandalia, Smithville, Higginsville and Concordia. Vandalia is in the process of updating their watershed management plan to convert it to an SWPP. Smithville is also updating their plan but using a 319 minigrant to have public meetings to get public input to convert it to an SWPP. Dan said they will be working with Higginsville and Concordia to update their plans, which are four-five years old.

Dan said they received positive feedback on the “Resource Tools for Successful Watersheds” workshop held in March. There were approximately 150 attendees. The purpose of the event was to connect local watershed practitioners with the available resources. Dan felt they were successful.

For the next year, plans are to work with Ward Branch in Greene County, St. Francois County, Hinkson Creek in Boone County, and Spring Fork Lake in Pettis County to set up watershed management groups to develop plans. John said 3 of these projects are areas that did not have plans in place prior to implementing their projects.

Terry Frueh is Chairman of a group of associated watersheds in Boone County. This is a group of people doing watershed-related work that get together monthly to share ideas and coordinate informally. Bonne Femme Watershed group, Show-Me Clean Streams, FAPRI, Boone Co SWCD attend. One of their efforts is to develop relationships in the development community to do watershed-friendly developments. This is a way of serving citizens needs and accomplishing goals.

The next meeting of the Jacks Fork watershed group is scheduled for April 26 at the Courthouse. Angel mentioned that “River Etiquette” would be on the reverse side of the “public accessible restroom facilities” information at the signage. They have met with several challenges in order to make this happen.

These watershed groups have each taken about one year to get where they are after the initial TMDL meeting. Becky said DNR is trying to get EPA funding to set up a small grant program specifically to fund for watershed base planning. This won’t be available for a while yet.

Other

303(d) List Issues – Update, Phil Schroeder, DNR, WPP

Phil said there is a rule, almost. A proposal was brought before the CWC for Final Order of Rulemaking for a General Methodology Rule on March 10 and because of lingering stakeholder issues, staff were directed to go back and meet with stakeholders to reach a consensus and a better understanding of how the rule should be written. A stakeholder meeting was held and a rule was brought back to the CWC, which they adopted. The rule is being filed with the Joint Committee of Administrative Rules and will reside there for 30 days. It then goes to Secretary of State’s office for publication in the Missouri Register for 30 days before being printed in the Code of State Regulations. It takes another 30 days before it becomes effective. The real work then begins. The rule states that another stakeholder’s meeting would be held to develop a more detailed methodology. This would be the beginning of compiling a 303(d) list of waters that all can agree will be well founded and based on data that is scientifically defensible. A date for the meeting of the stakeholders should

be decided this week. Notification of this date will be sent to the WQCC group. Phil said hopefully that process will go well and a document can be presented to the CWC. The rule states that once a development document with all details has been through a stakeholder process, it goes back to the CWC for approval before actually beginning to do a 303(d) list. After CWC approval, it would be posted for 60 days for public comment. Then the process of compiling a list of impaired waters in Missouri would begin. This would also be done through stakeholder involvement.

Despite all this work, Phil said they have told EPA that DNR could adhere to the schedule and get a 303(d) list to them by July 2005. The Missouri Register is available on Internet on the Secretary of State's web site.

Letters of Approval for Animal Feeding Operations, Becky Shannon, DNR, WPP

Becky informed the group that in the proposed Governor's budget, there was an elimination of General Revenue funding that supports DNR staff that do Letters of Approval for Animal Feeding Operations. These are voluntary approvals that consist of a letter, not a permit, that facilities below the threshold for a permit can apply for and receive. These are usually requested for the purpose of receiving funding, a loan or grant funding through the various programs. There is no federal requirement or state law that requires DNR to do the letters but DNR has done these for several years. If the budget goes through as proposed, DNR is looking at ceasing that activity. Some funding sources for animal waste systems, like 319 grants or a loan program through the Department of Agriculture, require a Letter of Approval in order to receive funding. DNR is looking at alternative requirements for those where a Letter of Approval is required. A potential alternative that they are looking at is that they would accept documentation from NRCS that the animal waste system meets their field technical office guides or a certification from a registered professional engineer. Details are still being worked on. If the budget goes through as proposed, the funding would no longer be available July 1, 2004. DNR would no longer accept applications after May 31, 2004. Applications for projects received would be completed. Becky said the department would have a better idea of how this will work when the budget is finalized.

A question was asked about revisions to the regulations since the LOA process is included. Becky was going to check on this.

Agency Activities

Bob Lerch said they are waiting on the RFP for Conservation, Effects and Assessment Project, which is basically an ARS/NRCS-led watershed effort to assess the conservation programs and Farm Bill. There is an RFP coming out to CSREES and EPA that would fund partners in the Mark Twain and Salt River Basin. Time is running short.

Terry Frueh informed the group about an RFP that they put out to do subwatershed analysis. It has not been awarded yet. This will be a big and unique effort. They are putting together a stakeholder committee. They also have a Policy Committee with decision level policy people. These committees are the key to the whole process.

Angel Kruzen announced the Jacks Fork River Cleanup will be on June 5. They generally have a contest for the weirdest things found.

Larry Shepard said EPA is working with Phil's group on revisions to state Water Quality Standards. These are on the spotlight because of litigation and lawsuits against EPA. He announced the Missouri River Natural Resources Conference in Columbia on May 23-26. The group out of Columbia, River Relief, will be doing another Missouri River cleanup starting in St. Charles in May and end up in Kansas City on June 19. Donna said the cleanup in Jefferson City is May 15. Dan said the River Relief group has been helping to facilitate an

educational programs for schools the day before the clean ups. One is scheduled for April 30 in Columbia Bottoms. Check out www.riverrelief.org for more information.

Bob Broz announced the Groundwater Conference that will be held April 23 in Springfield that is sponsored by the Soil & Water Conservation Society. May 10-12 is the Illinois/Missouri shared experience watershed program. They were asked to have 10-12 people from Missouri. The cost would be 2 days of hotel room and meals. They will tour 2-3 watersheds. Let Bob know if you are interested. June 19 and 26 is an education program in south Springfield put on by Janice Greene and the MoWIN project to educate teachers. On August 2, the North Fork Project is holding their water quality and nonpoint source environmental education workshop where attendees can get college credits or just for information. June 8-10 will be the 4-State Phosphorus Roundtable held in Nebraska City, Nebraska. Attendance is limited; contact Bob if you would like to attend.

Miya Barr mentioned that the 2003 Annual Data Report is now available on the USGS web site, www.mo.water.usgs.gov.

Kenny Struempf mentioned that of the 26 SALT proposals received, 13 will be recommended to the Commission for funding at the May 19 commission meeting. This is approximately \$9.5 million.

Colleen Meredith said the Quad-State Poultry Dialogue meeting will be held May 5-6 in Fayetteville, Arkansas. May 5 will be discussion on Litter Education. Registration is free.

Donna Menown said the Introduction to Volunteer Water Quality Monitoring training workshops through the Stream Team Program began last month. There will be four workshops held in June. The schedule is online at www.mostreamteam.org. She also mentioned she would be attending the national monitoring conference in Chattanooga, Tennessee, May 16-20.

Paul Andre informed the group that as part of the IRED (for Atrazine), registrants will be doing monitoring in the state in three sites. Those include South Fabius in Knox and Lewis counties, Little Sni-A-Bar in Lafayette County and Youngs Creek in Audrain County.

Gail Wilson said the Second Nicholson Creek TMDL is off Public Notice and no comments were received. She is in the process of getting it ready to submit to EPA. The Cedar/Manacle Creek TMDL will be on Public Notice starting Friday, April 23. A James River TMDL meeting will be held April 20 in Springfield. It is a phased TMDL and this is the first of the meetings to begin the revision work.

Phil Schroeder mentioned stakeholder meetings will be held this summer for discussions on the 303(d) list development and water quality standards issues and implementation, such as the anti-degradation rule. Information will be sent out soon.

Greg Anderson mentioned that the 2003 Nonpoint Source Management Plan has been approved by EPA. Staff are reviewing the 319 pre-proposals received. There will be a 319 grant training for applicants on May 12 in Jefferson City. The 2003 Annual Report is a work in progress. With the new load reduction reporting requirement, staff have developed an annual reporting worksheet to pass on to the project coordinators to help include this monitoring data in the Annual Report. They are also working with other agencies to get this information to include in the Annual Report and working to get a permanent point of contact.

Terry Frueh reminded the group that the St. Louis Earth Day Symposium is being held April 22-23 in St. Louis.

Meetings & Conferences

May	23-26	Missouri River Natural Resources Conference, Columbia
June	1-4	EPA's National Community Involvement conference in Denver, Colorado
	5	Jacks Fork River Cleanup
	8-10	4-State Phosphorus Roundtable, Nebraska City, Nebraska
	19	Missouri River Clean Up, St. Charles, Missouri
August	2-6	North Fork Project presents "Watersheds Concepts and Curriculum Review," Stoutsville